



32692

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Patent  
Case No.: 55763US002

## IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

First Named Inventor: ROSENFLANZ, ANATOLY Z.

Application No.: 09/618876

Group Art Unit: 1755

Filed: July 19, 2000

Examiner: Michael Marcheschi

Title: FUSED  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ - $\text{Y}_2\text{O}_3$ - $\text{ZrO}_2$  EUTECTIC ABRASIVE ARTICLES,  
ABRASIVE ARTICLES, AND METHODS OF MAKING AND  
USING THE SAMEDUE DATE(S) \_\_\_\_\_  
ATTORNEY GDA  
DOCKETED no**COMMENTS ON REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE AND CLARIFICATIONS TO  
SUPPLEMENTAL AMENDMENT UNDER RULE 111 DATED JANUARY 31, 2002  
AND AMENDMENT UNDER RULE 111 DATED JUNE 7, 2002**Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

## CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

To Fax No.: 703-872-9311

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent  
and Trademark Office on:

June 20, 2003

Date

Signed by: Lisa Hengen

Dear Sir:

It is not clear exactly what the Examiner means by the statement:

Notwithstanding applicants arguments with respect to the abrasive particle and specified nominal grade limitations defined in the response filed 6/12/02, the examiner now finds the claimed invention to be novel over the cited reference because said references fails to teach the specifically claimed eutectic composition of the instant claims. Although the examiners previous rejections have been all based on the references as teaching the claimed eutectics, after further review of the references, the examiner interprets the reference teachings of a eutectic as that of a conventionally known eutectic (i.e., alumina/zirconia eutectic) and **not** a eutectic which is formed from any and all of the components defined in the broad listing according to the references. In other words, the prior art **does not** suggest that the claimed components (components of the independent claims) form a eutectic, thus the instant claims are novel with respect to the claimed eutectic composition.